REMARKS

Claims 1, 5, and 10 have been amended. No claims have been canceled. No new claims have been added. Claims 1-19 are pending.

Claims 1-21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by French (U.S. Publication 2003/0041167-A1). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 1 recites, *inter alia,* "associating a geographic identifier with the application, wherein the geographic identifier identifies the predetermined operating region; after said associating, downloading the application and the geographic identifier to the device; ... preventing the application from executing when the device is outside the predetermined operating region." Claim 10 recites similar limitations in means-plus-function format.

Claim 5 recites, *inter alia,* "a geographic database that operates to associate the application with a geographic indicator that identifies the predetermined operating region; and processing logic that operates to match a device location with the predetermined operating region identified by the geographic indicator to determine whether the device is outside the predetermined operating region, wherein if the device is outside the predetermined operating region the application is prevented from operating."

Claim 15 recites, *inter alia,* "instructions for associating the application with a geographic indicator that identifies the predetermined operating region; ...; instructions for determining whether the device is outside the predetermined operating region; and instructions for preventing the application from operating if the device is outside the predetermined operating region."

French discloses a network management framework. Referring to Fig. 2A, French implements a network management framework in the context of a distributed system 210 comprising up to thousands of "nodes." The nodes may be geographically dispersed and are managed in a distributed manner. More specifically, the distributed system 210 is logically organized as a series of managed regions 212, each with its own management server 214. Each management server 214 is responsible for several gateways 216, and each gateway 216 supports a plurality of endpoints 218. Paragraph [0065]. Each endpoint may be a computing device.

5

Paragraph [0073]. Referring now to Fig. 2B, each gateway 216 runs a server component 222 of French's system management framework, while each endpoint 218 runs a client portion 224 of the framework. Paragraphs [0066] – [0067]. Referring now to Fig. 2C, the client portion 224 of the framework it itself divided into a daemon 226 and a runtime library 228. Paragraph [0072].

The network management framework provides an object oriented model of the network. Each logical or physical resource is represented by an object, and each instance of an object has an associated object identifier (OID). Paragraph [0087].

As illustrated by Figs. 3 and 4, each gateway includes an IP Object Persistence (IPOP) service 308, which is used to maintain information regarding discovered network objects. Information regarding discovered network object is maintained in a IPOP service database 402, which can also store topological objects associated with each discovered object.

French therefore discloses an object oriented network management framework including components located on the management servers, gateways, and endpoints of a large distributed network. Each component is comprised of executing software, for example, the daemons running on each endpoint.

The Office Action asserts at French discloses every aspect of the claimed invention. It is respectfully asserted that the Office Action is in error.

The Office Action alleges that French discloses: "associating a geographic identifier with the application" (as recited by claim 1), "a geographic database that operates to associated the application with a geographic identifier that identifies the predetermined operating region" (as recited by claim 5), "means for associating the application with a geographic indicator that identifies the predetermined operating region" (as recited by claim 10), and "instructions for associating the application with a geographic indicator that identifies the predetermined operating region" by citing paragraphs [0016], [0092], and [0101] - [0102], [0166], [0171]. It is respectfully asserted that the Office Action is in error.

More specifically, paragraph [0016] discloses providing network security at a boundary between networks. Paragraph [0092] discloses using IP commands and SNMP commands to manage endpoints of a network. Paragraph [0101] – [0102] describes Fig. 4, which illustrates

6

the IP Object Persistence service database. Paragraph [0166] discloses a login system. Paragraph [0171] discloses a database. Simply put, there is no disclosure or suggestion regarding associating any type of geographic identifier with an underline application. The Topological Objects in the French's database are not associated with any application.

The Office Action also asserts that French discloses "downloading the application and the geographic identifier to the device" (as recited by claim 1) and cites paragraph [0072] – [0075], by interpreting the daemon and runtime library installed in French's endpoints as corresponding to the downloading of an application to the device in the present invention, and by interpreting an ID assigned to a customer as corresponding to a geographic identifier to the device. It is respectfully asserted that the Office Action is in error.

In French's system, the management framework is always executing, and the daemon and runtime library are components of the management framework which are present at the endpoints of the network. Accordingly, they cannot be the cited application which is downloaded and which can be prevented from executing because in French's network management system, they are required components. Further, the independent claims have been amended to clarify that the application is downloaded after a geographic identifier is associated with the application. Because the daemon is part of the management framework itself, in French's system, the daemon must first be executing (along with other components of the management framework) before French's system can discover the endpoint and associate a topological object with the endpoint (nb: i.e., not the application).

The Office Action also asserts that French discloses "preventing the application from executing when the device is outside the predetermined operating region" (as recited by claim 1), "processing logic that operates to match a device location with the predetermined operating region identified by the geographic indicator to determine whether the device is outside the predetermined operating region, wherein if the device is outside the predetermined operating region the application is prevented from operating" (as recited by claim 5), "means for preventing the application from operating if the device is outside the predetermined operating region" (as recited by claim 10), and "instructions for preventing the application from operating if the device is outside the predetermined operating region" (as recited by claim 15), by citing to paragraphs [0054], [0283], [0285] – [0287], [0294], and [0301].

Paragraph [0054] merely states that Figs. 21A-21B are flowcharts which illustrate how geographic location data is generated and associated with an <u>endpoint</u>. Paragraph [0283] describes how, based upon MAC addresses can be used to verify a historical database storing geographic locations of endpoints. Paragraphs [0285] – [0287] describe how restricting a laptop to certain geographic portions of the network can be used as a technique to detect stolen laptops. Paragraph [0294] describes French's distributed IP driver subsystem. Paragraph [0301] describes French's QSBG engine use of the IPOP database.

It is respectfully submitted that none of the cited paragraphs disclose or suggest any type of mechanism which prevents an application from executing if the device which is attempting to execute the application is outside a predetermined region, as recited in the above quoted portions of the independent claims.

Claims 1, 5, 10, and 15 are believed to be allowable over the prior art of record. The depending claims are believed to be allowable for at least the same reason as the independent claims. Applicants submit that the application is in condition for allowance, for which early action is requested.

8

CONCLUSION

In light of the amendments contained herein, Applicants submit that the application is in condition for allowance, for which early action is requested.

Please charge any fees or overpayments that may be due with this response to Deposit Account No. 17-0026.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated April 28, 2006
:   _____

By: /Robert J. O'Connell/ Reg. No. 44,265

for Christopher S. Chow
     Reg. No. 46,493
     (858) 845-3249

QUALCOMM Incorporated
Attn: Patent Department
5775 Morehouse Drive
San Diego, California 92121-1714
Telephone: (858) 658-5787
Facsimile: (858) 658-2502